



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/603,339	06/26/2000	James Alan Strothmann	RCA-88878	2228
24498	7590	01/11/2006	EXAMINER	
THOMSON LICENSING INC. PATENT OPERATIONS PO BOX 5312 PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312			SHANG, ANNAN Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/603,339

Applicant(s)

STROTHMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Annan Q. Shang

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9-17,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9-17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks/Arguments, filed 10/13/05, with respect to 1-6, 9-17 and 19-20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The finality of last office action has been withdrawn. However after further consideration a new office action is hereby being made with previously cited reference **Kanazawa et al (6,580,870)**. This office action is made final

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 14-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Kanazawa et al (6,580,870)** previously cited.

As to claims 1-2, note the **Kanazawa** reference figures 1-2, discloses systems and methods for reproducing audiovisual information with external information and further discloses a method for providing graphics for display, the claimed method comprises the following:

receiving a bitstream (Set top box 'STB' or IRD, 'a digital interface' col.8, lines 48-65) including an MPEG compliant program bitstream and a DVD subpicture compliant bitstream (figs.1-2 and 12, col.4, line 45-col.5, line 34 and col.7, lines 11-30);

extracting (CPU-1, col.6, lines 32-col.7, line 10) and decoding (MPEG-Decoder 112, col.10, line 55-col.11, line 15) the MPEG compliant bitstream to generate a program image signal (figs.10A-13C, 19A-B, col.14, lines 40-54 and col.15, lines 32-67);

extracting (CPU-1) and decoding (MPEG-Decoder 112, col.10, line 55-col.11, line 15) DVD subpicture compliant bitstream to generate a graphic image signal (col.17, line 50-col.18, line 23);

combining the program image signal and the graphic image signal to provide and output display signal (VGA Controller 113, 'a display processor' col.14, line 55-col.15, line 31), where the DVD subpicture compliant bitstream comprises an interactive graphic (see figs. 10A-13C, 19A-B, web mark 90, selectable regions 92b-c, 93, 95, etc.,) having selectable regions that, when selected, causes the display of other DVD subpicture graphics associated with the subpicture compliant bitstream (col.6, lines 37-col.7, line 64 and col.14, line 40-col.16, line 40), note that the plurality of DVD subpicture are extracted and decoded to generate a plurality of graphical image signals.

As to claim 3, Kanazawa further discloses where at least one of the DVD subpicture compliant bitstreams is buffered (col.14, lines 40-54 and col.15, lines 11-18)

As to claim 4, Kanazawa further discloses where at least one of the DVD subpicture compliant bitstreams repeats in the MPEG bitstream (figs.12, 18 and col.7, lines 11-30 and col.14, line 33+)

As to claim 5, Kanazawa further discloses where the DVD subpicture compliant bitstream comprises an MPEG still image (col.5, lines 1-54 and col.11, line 16+)

As to claim 6, Kanazawa further discloses where the DVD subpicture compliant bitstream comprises a program guide (col.5, lines 1-54).

Claim 9 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 1

As to claims 10-11, the claimed "a video signal processing apparatus..." is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 14 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 3.

Claim 15 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

Claim 16 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 3.

Claim 17 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 6.

As to claim 19, the claimed "a video signal processing apparatus..." is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed in the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 20, Kanazawa further discloses where the bitstream from the remote signal source further comprises at least a two MPEG compliant program bitstreams transmitted substantially concurrently by the remote signal source (col.5, lines 1-54 and col.11, line 16+ and col.14, line 40-col.16, line 40).

4. Claim 12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kanazawa et al (6,580,870)** as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of **Yanagihara et al (6,211,800)**.

As to claim 12, **Kanazawa**, fails to specifically teach where the receiving means comprises a digital interface and demodulator coupled to the digital interface and the MPEG decoder, where the digital interface is IEEE 1394 digital Interface.

However, note **Yanagihara** reference figure 5, disclose Data that is an MPEG program stream (PS) read out from a disc is supplied to a PS/TS Converter via a variable rate control section and PS/TS Converter converts the PS MPEG data into a transport stream (TS) and transmits it to a presentation device via a 1394 transmission/reception section where the 1394 transmission/reception section of the presentation device is classified by a DEMUX section, an audio, video decoder that decodes TS MPEG data and D/A converters that converts resulting digital data into analog signals and output the analog signals, note col. 5, line 43-col. 6, line 20.

Therefore the examiner submits it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Yanagihara into the system of Kanazawa in order provide and high speed interface that transfers good quality video with low bandwidth.

5. Claim 13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kanazawa et al (6,580,870)** as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of **Suzuki (6,344,836)**.

As to claim 13, **Kanazawa**, fails to specifically teach where the receiving means comprises a digital interface and demodulator coupled to the digital interface and where the digital interface is a USB digital interface.

However, note the **Suzuki** reference figure 1, disclose an information browsing system with one system device and a plurality of displays connected to the system device by a USB digital interface, note figure 1 and col. 5, lines 10-23 and col.6, line 6-20.

Therefore the examiner submits it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of into the system of Suzuki into the system of Kanazawa in order to provide a digital interface that easily connects devices together.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Leermakers (6,928,468) discloses system for broadcasting software applications and portable data communications device.

Okada et al (6,560,404) disclose reproduction apparatus and method including prohibiting certain images from being output for reproduction.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Annan Q. Shang** whose telephone number is **571-272-7355**. The examiner can normally be reached on **700am-400pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher S. Kelley** can be reached on **571-272-7331**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)**.



Annan Q. Shang.



CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600